9-19-07

P.O. Box 818, Middleburg, Virginia 20118
Phone (703) 754-1860 • Fax (703) 753-9481

e-mail: teklaw2000@aol.com

Corporate, File Assessment, Computer & Software, Licensing & Joint Venture Law, Venture Capital Information Technology

James W. Hiney Admitted to practice in the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commissioner of Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Express Mail No. EB 402163807 US

Sept. 14, 2007

RE: Status of Patent applications by Hundley, Serial No.s 10/790,545 and 11/214,266

Dear Commissioner,

Enclosed is a copy of an inquiry letter send last February 8,m 2007. We have not received any reply to this since it was sent. I am the attorney of record in both applications and these have been pending for a long, long time.

We have not received any word as to whether they were assigned to an Art Unit and/or Examiner. Have your people lost the cases? It seems as though each year the Office gets worse in response time to these inquires. As my client is a major employer in Virginia and has paid a hefty fee to file these cases it seems to me that your Office should be responsive to a status inquiry.

Please give this to one of your minions and have them find out the status and inform us forthwith. (P. S., that means "quickly".)

Again, note that the address of the undersigned is now in Middleburg, Virginia.

Respectfully submitted,

James W. Hiney, Esq. Attorney of Record

Enclosure:

RE TECHNOLOGY LAW OFFICES OF VIRGINIA

P.O. Box 818, Middleburg, Virginia 20118 Phone (703) 754-1860 • Fax (703) 753-9481 e-mail: leklaw2000@aol.com

Corporate, Patent A Boomark, Computer & Software, Licensing & Joint Venture Law; Venture Capital Employment Law

SEP 1 8 2007

James W. Hiney Admitted to practice in the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Feb. 8, 2007

Re: Patent applications by Hundley, Serial No. 10/790,545 and Serial No. 11/214,266.

Dear Sir,

The above noted applications were filed in March, 2004 and in August, 2005, respectively. This means that in the respective cases, approximately 3 years and 1.5 years have expired since the filings. We have not had an action and a check noted that while the cases have been assigned to Group Art Unit 1754 but no examiner has been noted for assignment of the cases.

Why have these cases lingered so long with no assignment to an Examiner and no action? Both cases have the same inventor, Joseph Hundley, and are the same subject matter as two other cases with the same inventor filed earlier and examined by Examiner Toomer in art unit 1714 and both of which have been allowed and issued as patents. Why have these cases been assigned to a different examiner when Ms. Toomer is familiar with this series of inventions?

Enclosed is a response filed in January 2006 on Serial No. 11/214266 which submitted replacement drawings for Figures 7 through 16 to comply with a Notice to file corrected application papers.

Please indicate by return mail what action date we can expect on these cases which have lingered too long in the PTO.

Note that the business and correspondence address of the undersigned has changed from the Blacksburg address of record to the Middleburg address as noted below and above in the letterhead.

Very truly yours,

James W. Hiney, Esq.

Attorney of Record

No. 24,705

P. O. Box 818

Middelburg, VA 20118

(703) 754-1860

xc: M. Richardson



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No.: 11/214,266)
Title: Improved Chemical Change Agent)
Applicant: Hundley, J. W)
Date of action: Sept. 29, 2006)

Response to Notice to File Corrected Application Papers

Now comes applicant and through his attorney, the undersigned, responds as follows to the above Notice a copy of which is attached hereto.

Despite attempts to reach the Legal Instruments Examiner no contact was made and hence this response is forwarded.

The Office noted that there is no brief description of the drawings as required by 37 CFR 1.74 and 1.77(b)(7). This position is in error as the specification as filed contains a brief description of Figures 1-16 on pages 15 and 16 of the specification. The specification contains additional descriptions of the Figures as follows:

Page 19 Figures 1 & 2
Page 21 Figures 3 & 4

Page 29	Figures 5 & 6
Page 37	Figures 7 & 8
Page 39	Figures 9, 10 & 11
Page 40	Figures 12 & 13
Page 41	Figure 14
Page 46	Figure 15
Page 49	Figure 16

The second item that the Notice mentioned was complaints about the drawings. The figures in question are figures 7 through 16 as Figures 1-6 are acceptable as they are the same figures accepted by the Patent Office in the two U. S. Patent Applications Ser. No. 10/790,545 and Ser. No. 09/757,765 (which is now a patent containing the Figures 1-6) upon which the instant case depends

Replacement drawings are submitted herewith for Figures 7 through 16 to comply with the requirement. Attached hereto is a check for \$510.00 which is the amount due for the three month extension under 1.17(a)(3) the action having been mailed on Sept. 29th, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

James. W. Hiney, Esq. Attorney of Record Reg. No. 24,705 1872 Pratt Drive, Suite 1100 Blacksburg, VA 24060 (540) 552-4400

Certification of Mailing

, , , ,

l, James W. Hiney, do hereby certify that a signed copy of this response with enclosures was deposited, Express Mail Postage Prepaid, No. EQ 047681394 US, with the United States Postal Service, addressed to the Commissioner of Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, this 27th day of January, 2006.

James W. Hiney